

REMARKS

New claims 10-12 are added so as more fully to claim patentable aspects of Applicant's invention. These amendments introduce no impermissible new matter. These amendments are supported by Applicant's disclosure, for example, new claim 10 is supported by unamended claims 2 and 3.

Therefore, claims 1-12 are the claims currently pending in the present Application.

Rejection of Claims 1, 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Blanchard et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,408,191 and Borland, U.S. Patent No. 6,320,943. This rejection is traversed.

Among the insights recognized by Applicant's claimed invention is that the importance to a user of a portable telephone of a telephone number or a party may be reflected by the number of times that the telephone number or party is called from the portable telephone and the number of times that the telephone number or party calls to the portable telephone. According to an aspect of Applicant's claimed invention, outgoing and incoming telephone calls are tracked, such that a frequency of outgoing and incoming telephone calls to or from the particular number or party may be displayed to the user.

Independent claims 1, 4 and 7 require, *inter alia*, displaying the

total number of cases of the retrieved data, the total number of cases being a number of times that a number represented by an item of the retrieved data called the portable telephone set and was called by the portable telephone set.

The Examiner acknowledges that Blanchard does not disclose that the data retrieved are displayed together with the total number of cases, the total number of cases being a number of times the number represented by item of the retrieved data at least one of called the portable telephone set and was called by the portable telephone set. However, the Examiner alleges that Borland discloses these features.

Borland discloses an electronic directory system and method which provides priority information that may include an indication of usage of the communication device (Borland, Abstract), such that when the user enters a key to retrieve a telephone number in the address book, the priority information may include a number indicating the number of times a particular number has been called (Borland, column 8, lines 28-42; Figures 6 A-B).

Borland does not disclose or suggest displaying the total number of cases of the retrieved data, the total number of cases being a number of times that a number represented by an item of the retrieved data called the portable telephone set and was called by the portable telephone set, as *inter alia* required by independent claims 1, 4 and 7. First, Borland does not disclose or suggest keeping track of the number of times that the number called the portable telephone set. That is, Borland does not disclose or suggest usage information

corresponding to incoming calls received from a particular number or party made to the portable telephone device.

Since Borland does not disclose or suggest this feature, Borland is incapable of disclosing or suggesting displaying the total number of cases of the retrieved data, the total number of cases being a number of times that a number represented by an item of the retrieved data called the portable telephone set and was called by the portable telephone set, as further required by independent claims 1, 4 and 7. Therefore, Borland does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1, 4 and 7. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2, 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious from Blanchard, Borland and Cushman. This rejection is traversed.

Cushman does not cure the deficiencies of Blanchard and Borland as they relate to Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 4 and 7, from which claims 2, 5, 8, respectively, depend. Therefore, claims 2, 5 and 8 incorporate novel and nonobvious features of their respective base claims, and are thus patentably distinguishable over prior art for at least the reasons that independent claims 1, 4 and 7, respectively, are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "George Brieger". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "George" and last name "Brieger" clearly distinguishable.

George Brieger
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343, Ext. 508

GB:kd